If a federal election had been held on May 24, 2026—the date of the most recent projection put out by the poll aggregator 338Canada—the CPC would have won 99 HoC seats, the exact same number that they won in 2015 under Harper. However, if you rewind just under a year-and-a-half, back to January 5, 2025—the day before Justin Trudeau's resignation announcement—the CPC was looking to capture 236. The LPC, meanwhile, was plummeting towards a measly 35 seats—just one seat higher than their 2011 cataclysm under Ignatieff. This abysmal performance would have landed them, like in 2011, in third place, with the Bloc forming official opposition. Today, the LPC cruises towards a healthy majority of 212 seats—one seat higher than Brian Mulroney's record total in 1984, which would make it the largest majority in Canadian history in terms of raw seat numbers[1].

How, you may ask, did this happen? How did a party on the verge of a supermajority, presumed for well over a year to be a government-in-waiting, end up back at square one, back where Harper left them well over a decade ago? Why, after a myriad of LPC failures,

was the party predicated on opposing the LPC's every move unable to capitalize on the LPC's malignant mismanagement of the country?

The answer, as you shall see, *mon frère*, has to with Pierre. And how he got pwned. More specifically, how his pwnage has to do with the broader ideological forces that undergird the movement he came up in politically and is defined by.

A good starting place in this examination of pwnage would be a phrase that is sprinkled and interspersed frequently throughout Pierre's speeches and public statements: *anyone* from *anywhere* can be *anything*. I'll call it AAA for short.

(Think of it like Alcoholics Anonymous with an extra "A" tacked on—Alcoholics Anonymous Anywhere anyone? Our goal is to quit Pierre's twelve step and go back to hitting the bottle.)

As Pierre understands it, this slogan is not just a mere piece of rhetoric. It is the defining promise of the Canadian nation, the foundation on which this country wrests. To him, if there is no AAA, there is no Canada.

What first jumps out at you about this phrase is the lack of constraints—*anyone*, *anywhere*, *anything.* There is no sense of natural hierarchy, no understanding of biological limitations and man's fallibility. No, everything is seemingly ripe for the taking. This is the general theme on which my critique wrests; however, it is worth drilling down into each word here and examining its function as it relates to the phrase writ large.

First up is *anyone.* The use of *anyone* presupposes that Canada is not a nation for *some* people who have a shared cultural understanding and sense of belonging, but also for those who fall outside of this circle of understanding—even, potentially, for those who are actively hostile and contemptuous towards those within the circle. *Anyone* negates the possibility of shared heritage being a component of national identity, or the idea that those with deeper historical ties to a polity could be considered to be more a part of that polity than those with weaker ties.

Anyone naturally opens the door to *anywhere*. Since there are no limits on who can be considered Canadian, New Canadians can naturally be

sourced from any geographic location on the planet. To Pierre, the citizenry of Canada comes not primarily from the British Isles, France, and the rest of the European continent, but from *anywhere.* From Mogadishu. From Port-au-Prince. From Amritsar. Definitely from Amritsar. Might even want to create some direct flights to Amritsar. Canada, according to him, is not a distinct group of people, an *ethnos* created from *ethnogenesis*, or even a nation of people whose ancestors disproportionately hail from a certain continent. Rather, it is a land of unbounded aspirations, a place that anyone "with a dream and a suitcase" can use as a 9.98 million km^2 hotel. Maybe a hotel *sans* carbon tax but a hotel nonetheless. The people have no particular or distinct connection to the land that they inhabit, but instead serve as interchangeable and atomized economic units, chips on the board that can be shuffled to wherever the highest-paying widget factory exists.

Finally, we have *anything*. This, out of the three A's, is the most utopian of the bunch. While *anyone* and *anywhere* characterize the composition and character of those who inhabit Canada, *anything* deals with what Canada's inhabitants can achieve. Which, apparently, is anything they set

their minds to. There is no recognition of IQ being a reasonably accurate predictor of life success, or, conversely, the role that mental and physical illness—or, more broadly, the inherent fallibility of man—can play in preventing certain aims from being actualized. *Anything* evinces a blank slatist mentality that assumes neurological uniformity across all humans, something that is most definitely false.

Now, by this point, it should be patently clear, if it wasn't already, how vacuous and facile AAA is. It contains about as much meaning as Chomsky's phrase "colourless green ideas sleep furiously". Yet, you may ask, why hasn't there been much pushback to Pierre's usage of the phrase from the right? Why has this howler been allowed to fly? This lack of scrutiny could be attributed to a sense that AAA is purely aspirational, as opposed to an accurate descriptor of reality. But this too seems odd. Isn't one of the core components of right-wing politics an inherent skepticism of utopian abstractions and unbridled idealism?

The reason why this is the case is that AAA, despite its faults, is the natural endpoint of the blank slatist libertarianism that has been the

default mode of the Canadian right-of-centre for at least the past five decades, if not longer. It is the logical disposition of a worldview that is fundamentally materialist in nature, concerned mostly with economic outcomes and deeply indifferent to anything outside of that purview. Pierre, a byproduct of the Reform Party in terms of electoral politics and Rand/Friedman/Hayek in terms of intellectual foundations, has always, since his first forays into politics over 30 years ago, been an orthodox adherent of this line of thinking. There is no evidence that he has ever seriously questioned any of these presuppositions of his, and he has rarely strayed from them during his time in politics. Any supposed apostasy of his in this regard can largely be chalked up to political expediency.

While AAA is incoherent, the core problem with it is that, as you may have noticed, is that the axioms it operates within pave the way for leftism. Blank slatism, since it discards any biological component in human outcomes, naturally leads to those who embrace it asking what else might cause disparities between groups. Right-liberals usually offer some reluctant and cagey answer regarding “work ethic” and “culture”,

but, to many reasonable questioners, these responses seem wholly unconvincing. What seems convincing, meanwhile, is the answer of discrimination, which leads the questioner to endorsing ham-fisted attempts at "equity" in order to rectify the situation. Additionally, a view of humans as rational economic units inexorably opens the door to replacement migration. If ethnocultural heritage is completely subordinate to GDP, then why not open the floodgates to TFWs and subcontinentals with expired student visas? After all, they can be paid less and treated as *defacto* chattel slaves, which means increased profit margins. The "rational economic units" view also lends itself nicely to a laissez-faire approach on other cultural issues, which, at best, cedes ground to the left and allows them free reign to push their agenda; at worst, laissez-faire bleeds into "conservatives" actively supporting the left's cultural project.

Now, those in the CPC may protest what I've just said. *We don't support the left's agenda! This is hokum! Woke right PPC nonsense!* To which I say: on a certain level, that's probably correct. You probably don't endorse every granular policy prescription the LPC pulls out of its hat. But much of the

left's agenda, despite what you may think, is simply your presuppositions and axioms taken to their logical conclusions. This is why the left's ideology appears more attractive to those inside elite institutions—when the only right-of-centre ideas on display are right-liberal in nature, left-liberalism will always win, as it's more internally coherent.

So far in this piece, I have addressed the pwnage question mostly in terms of Pierre's (and the CPC's) ideological deficiencies on an abstract and conceptual level. There is, though, a very real electoral impact.

Consider, for example, the roiling saga of the floor crossings. In the last few months, there has been a perpetual drip of MPs switching parties, with all-but-one of them being in the CPC to LPC direction. Naturally, this has caused much consternation among CPC apparatchiks, who have sought to paint the LPC as a bunch of cynical Machiavellians, roping in CPC MPs by dangling shiny baubles in front of their faces so they can reach the 172-seat majority threshold (which happened last month). The ex-CPC quislings, in turn, are portrayed as consummate opportunists, willing to betray all principles and values for the perks of sitting on the

government bench. All of this, to a certain extent, is true. However, a crucial question, one that the CPC much prefers to leave unanswered, remains: how were those CtL[2] MPs so easily persuaded by the promise of shiny baubles? The opportunist charge can go a certain way to explaining this, but not entirely. What is missing is the fact that, on some level, the CtLs shared a baseline ideological framework with the Liberals that made even the concept of switching sides seem somewhat palatable. The right-liberalism of the CPC and the left-liberalism of the LPC and its Laurentian counterparts are ultimately children of a common mother. One is slower than the other, less coherent in its self-conception, and less fashionable among the ruling class, but it still biologically related to its sharper and more handsome brother.

The other, and perhaps more consequential, electoral impact of right-liberalism concerns its *American* nature, and the significance of that Americanness in the context of the 2025 election. The U.S. was founded on the sort of libertarian idealism Pierre champions, with founding fathers such as Jefferson and Paine espousing ideas of decentralization, blank slatism, and emancipatory egalitarianism.

Canada, however—with the exception of the CPC base in Alberta and Saskatchewan—has never adhered to such a philosophy. Our ideological foundations are, if not collectivist, then decidedly communitarian; doctrines of individual liberty, free markets, and limited government are spurned in favour of an emphasis on order and the common good, a corporatist economic model, and a Gaullist approach to governance that includes public spending on nation-building projects.

In the context of the 2025 election, with anti-American fervor at a high-point, a right-liberal framework was doomed from the beginning. While Pierre tried to deflect from his ideological roots with an emphasis on "Canada First", it was obvious that this shift was made reluctantly, and therefore came across as unconvincing. Carney, fufilling the quintessentially Canadian archetype of the peevish colonial governor, was a much more natural fit. Seemingly overnight, Pierre's once-formidable command of the polls evaporated into thin air and his fate was sealed.

Now, you may ask, if Pierre's ideology is, essentially, a milder variant of what the LPC believes, and it presents an active hindrance to his electoral chances, then why does the LPC go out of its way to lampoon Pierre for his supposed "extremism"? A component of this may be that, to Laurentians, any ideas that are thought to be American in character are coded as extreme. Then again, the Laurentians' left-liberal progressivism was also directly imported from south of the border, albeit from Blue instead of Red America.

What I suspect is the answer is that, ultimately, the ideas a politician professes are filtered through his personality. A soft-spoken politician can be dogmatic while coming across as measured and reasonable; a brash and abrasive politician, on the other hand, can be anything but an idealogue yet come off as more of one than someone with a gentler temperament. Pierre, unsurprisingly, falls into the latter category. His nails-on-a-chalkboard persona and penchant for rhetorical combat make him seem like a dime-store Ben Shapiro. Right-liberalism, when preached by him, sounds like Enver Hoxha; when it's preached by Milton Friedman, it sounds like Julius Martov.

Such a combination of ideological inadequacy and personal belligerence is perhaps the worst of both worlds. It gives off the false impression of extremism, which activates the LPC's friend-enemy distinction. However, the policies that are proposed will merely rachet things back to a previous iteration of liberalism. Pierre thinks he is putting up a serious fight against the Laurentian machine; instead, he is merely falling into the Venus flytrap they have carefully constructed. He attacks, he is demonized, but he has no chance of wielding power. In other words, he is pwned.

1
Technically, the largest majority government in Canadian history in terms of the percentage of seats captured is Diefenbaker's 1958 win. He won 208 seats in a then-265 seat HoC, which means that 78.49% of MPs came from his party.

2
Conservative to Liberal. Sort of like FtM or MtF. Political troons, if you will.